The conceptual keywords that have surfaced for me thus far are: corporeal, process, and install.

The zoomed-out, macro version of what I'm doing is trying to understand the rhetorical capacities of bodies, which, this semester, has meant exploring bodies interacting and iterating with spaces. I want to better understand the ways the body exists within and acts upon processes of knowledge production. Of course, "exist within" and "act upon" are linguistic relationships between bodies and spaces that feel incredibly limited, but are close enough to what I know I mean right now. Roughly, to centralize the body in meaning making is to also deeply consider the conditions and entanglements of the spaces bodies are in.

To zoom in a little, I'm seeing corporeal as a sticky concept due to 1) its insistence upon the matter and material of bodies, and 2) the impossibility of its own definition. When I looked up the definition of corporeal, I was surprised by the secondary clause: "relating to a person's body, especially as opposed to their spirit." I'm not sure that's what I actually mean; ultimately, and in a pretty selfish way, the intervention I'm seeking right now is to make friendly my body and my thought processes, to make central my body to my writing, thinking, and meaning making capacities. At the same time, I want to understand a schema for meaning making in community, one that decenters my own role in creating, making, curating, or installing, and instead is deeply attentive to how that's happening beyond and outside of my body, but always in relation. As a result, I'm relying upon corporeal as a sort of legible beacon of the material of bodies, but hoping to trouble it a bit in my turn towards process.

I see the key concepts of process and install as going together: while I was initially interested in what scholars have called installation rhetorics, I'm seeing my thoughts actually cohere around an argument against nominalization. Turning the verb "install" into a static and singular noun via "installation" belies the motions of installing, and I think makes background the *interactions inherent in the processes of installing*. In other words, when the matter and material of "an installation" are foregrounded via a focus on the rhetorics of installation itself, it's harder to sense the centrality of bodies to installation's meaning-making capacities, or the constant, always-already-ness of the processes of co-constitutive relationships between bodies, meaning, and material. To retain the verb "install" is to insist upon the epistemic impossibility of the nominalization or noun-ing. I'd also argue that nouning implies or makes more real the assumed identifiability of "the" orchestrator of an installation, again obfuscating the always-already-ness of what's installed around, within, and between us. Sooo, I imperfectly turn instead to process, to motion, plurality, and movement.

The expansiveness of how one can deploy the verb form "to install" began with a really physical interest in installation, focused especially on the presentation of the outcome of curating and creating. Again, this understanding of installation relies on it as a place, a product, rather than an always-already condition of space. I think the turn to process allows me to make what feels like a more authentic argument: that we can understand all spaces we inhabit as installed, or installing (emphasis on verb form). To consider installation is actually to consider what it means *to install*, especially as the language is used in different contexts, whether mechanical, digital, or organizational.

Thinking about what it means to insist upon install as a verb (rather than installation as a noun) is helping me understand how rhetoric can tie together some of the theory threads that I'm feeling snagged on. I'm thinking

about Jane Bennett's call to "use words to make whatever communications already at work between vibrant bodies more audible, more detectable, more sense-able" (242), and feeling like it's extra important to pay special attention to the ways I'm calling upon language to communicate something that is fundamentally extra-linguistic, like bodies' relationships to and with spaces. In other words, while it might seem pedantic or boring or unnecessary, I think remaining committed to the precise deployment of language forms and parts of speech (while remaining open their imperfect capacities) makes think-able and sense-able the onto-epistemic relationships between bodies and spaces, and to the installed.

To end with a concrete example, in *The Body Multiple,* Annemarie Mol writes that treating everything as a practice allows you to talk about the whole of "it" all in one breath (156-7), making central to words the processes, materials, and bodies that comprise "it." Though certainly an imperfect and false binary, I'm thinking an anti-nominalization, pro-verbing can do some of this work in the context of bodies and spaces, at least in recognizing or continuing to surface the processes or practices involved in bodies' complex, plural, and constitutive relationships with space.

NOTES from class feedback

→ verbiage of install, what is the scope and what are the bodies in action, processes of install

-how do they create different corporeal relationships with space

-incorporeal - liz grosz

- what does the verb form allow me to pay attention to differently

- what's the after, how does it move through time? → Barad

-installation of medical devices; IUDs; corporeality → copper; actively changing the interior landscape

-in-stall; to keep an animal for slaughter

-conceptual link of corporeality

-subject-object relationship, shrinking or expanding of the agential relationship

-how a space is installing the bodies in it

---

https://demeterfragrance.com/collections/beetroot

Above, I wrote about retaining verbs as their verb form, and resisting nominalization because it might reduce processes to static sites and obfuscate their constant movement. I'm interested in installing as speculating (or installation as speculation, but verb it), an the un-done-ness of and open-endedness of speculative spaces. To

make a space speculative is in to some ways refuse the legibility and curated structure of a space... we walk into a space with expectations, but to make it speculative (or speculating) does something *against* what spaces are supposed to be – useful. What does it mean to resist use value? What does resisting use value do?

A throughline I've really appreciated in practicum this semester (and worked to embrace) is disrupting my ideas of what research looks like, and what "a productive use of time" looks/feels/sounds like. One way I've disrupted that is by embracing process, and leaning into experimentation even and especially when I'm unsure of the nature of–or "use value"–of the outcome. The possibility that a step in a process is not useful actually melts away when the researcher is oriented towards the process as a whole rather than the outcome.

As we saw in Maddie's curation activity, curating feels like it requires a very careful set of steps–it's intentional, responsible, organized, structured by some logic, and, I'd argue, outcome-driven.

I'm interested in anti-curating... what does it look like to be unorganized with one's ideas, messy with materials, irresponsible with time? What can anti-curating do? Or... what can anti-installation do?

The expansiveness of how one can deploy the verb form "to install" began with a really physical interest in installation, focused especially on the presentation of the outcome of curating and creating. Again, this understanding of installation relies on it as a place, a product, rather than an always-already condition of space.

The turn to process allows me to make what feels like a more authentic argument: that we can understand all spaces we inhabit as installed, or installing (emphasis on verb form). To consider installation is actually to consider what it means *to install*, especially as the language is used in different contexts, whether mechanical, digital, or organizational.

To consider installation, I want to turn my attention to what it means *to install*

What are you installing in this space? What am I?

My installation is process-driven, so I want it to be interactive.
I also want to do the "Powers of the Hoard" thing and follow Bennett's call to"use words to make whatever communications already at work between vibrant bodies more audible, more detectable, more sense-able" (242). Vibrant bodies are both human and non-human, as all can emit communications; a chair communicates ability to be sat upon... right?

Maybe I'm interested in producing multiple conditions for experiencing and engaging participants in a process of making more sense-able, more detect-able the space?

Where do I experience feeling/being installed?
How can I speculate towards a reality that is plural, in-motion, always verbed, resistant of curation?

How can I dis-habituate?
How can I access the non-curated?

Maybe my installation is a process of un-installing and dis-habituating towards the processes of making more sense-able, more detect-able one's body, surroundings, multiples, realities?

Maybe my anti-installation, un-curation is an installation of dishabituating

I think I want to put people in a sort of speculative sensory experience...
Maybe have a variety of sensory tools available...
Ear plugs?
Clothes that aren't yours?
Moving space... like wave light or bubble machine?
Kaleidoscope...
Sit upside down
Dirt perfume/surprising scents?
Be assigned a condition to inhabit in the space... if you were an alien, what would you experience?
Diffraction glasses
Jingle bells on shoes

Are vibrant bodies' communications and relationships fundamentally extra-linguistic?

I think something that runs through each of my obstructions this semester has been a process of dishabituating... from my research process, from my expectations of time and use-value, from the kinds of questions I usually ask, etc.

I still think that there's something to the condition of being upside down, and the process of being turned.

DECEMBER 5

→ For Friday – research statement, and 5-minute presentation of installation ideas

→ We'd also like you to present a diorama (defined however you see fit) of a plan for your installation, and talk a bit (5ish minutes) about your plan for next semester. Consider how you will incorporate a digital element to your installation- this can be fleshed out next semester, but start brainstorming and try to incorporate something digi into your diorama.

"use words to make whatever communications already at work between vibrant bodies more audible, more detectable, more sense-able" (Bennett 242)

524 Words for Casey:

I started this semester with an interest in installation and a commitment to exploration. I've been thinking about installation rhetorics for a few semesters, and wanted to understand what drives this curiosity. Practicum has been super useful in letting me interact with installation from various angles and dive deeper into this enduring interest.

During the original interview obstruction, I was inspired by Casey's piece on the obliqueness of rhetoric, and wanted to re-think installations through the lens of slanting methodologies and experiences of space. I first experimented with turning a camera upside down to "interview" spaces through my new visual orientation towards them, and then was excited by the idea of interviewing while hanging physically upside down. What I liked about inviting upside-down-ness into a research process is that the condition invites a bodily comportment that's both nostalgic and playful (think kids on playground monkey bars) and vulnerable–to be upside down is to expose oneself differently to the world, and to consent to experience a space (however familiar) from a position of relative discomfort.

I wanted to continue exploring this embodied tension in our next obstruction, and "installed" a key feature of my bedroom–the over-bed canopy that hangs from the ceiling–upside down, so the center sat in the middle of my floor and the gauzy drapery was pinned up to the walls. I lived with this (very inconvenient) arrangement for a week, and felt myself reorienting affectively towards my space. To live with upside-down-ness was novel, but the difficulty of navigating a space that I'm used to experiencing as homey and familiar quickly became frustrating. I took field notes on how I had to twist my body to orient myself to this space anew, and saw affinities between my embodied experience of the installation and my interest in intellectually and affectively re- or un-installing orientations to a research process.

After Hannah's workshop on interstitiality, I played with installing theory into a collage of images of the Ellsworth Kelly chapel. This project let me curate a public space in ways that make clearer the invisible/ized orientations that we bring to and encounter in the wild. This argument–that spaces are always already installations of some sort–helped me to explain why I see bodies being so important to studies of rhetoric, and draws connections between embodied rhetoric and installation rhetorics. In my next obstruction, I re-emphasized the connection between space and body, and made a corporeal diorama out of found materials and secondhand fibers, which let me dwell with the idea of installation as ubiquitous and the body as a site of

un/installing. Here my interest shifted to what it means *to install*, whether mechanical, digital, or organizational.

Install/ation, process, and corporeality were sticky throughout the semester, and Claire and Kimber's feedback on my conceptual keyword paper pointed me towards dishabituation as a site for exploring the process of embodied un/installing. Next semester, I want to explore dishabituation through a multisensorial installation experience, and to think through how centering bodies in inquiries around process might make more sense-able and more detect-able (to borrow from Bennett) the entanglement of bodies and spaces/multiples/realities.

-Where do I experience feeling/being installed?
How can I speculate towards a reality that is plural, in-motion, always verbed, resistant of curation?
How can I dis-habituate?
How can I access the non-curated?

I think I want to put people in a sort of speculative sensory experience...
Maybe have a variety of sensory tools available...
Ear plugs?
Clothes that aren't yours?
Moving space... like wave light or bubble machine?
Kaleidoscope...
Sit upside down
Dirt perfume/surprising scents?
Be assigned a condition to inhabit in the space... if you were an alien, what would you experience?
Diffraction glasses
Jingle bells on shoes

Are vibrant bodies' communications and relationships fundamentally extra-linguistic?

I think something that runs through each of my obstructions this semester has been a process of dishabituating... from my research process, from my expectations of time and use-value, from the kinds of questions I usually ask, etc.